

## REMARKS

### Summary of the Office Action And Procedural History

Claims 1-441 were pending in the above-identified patent application. Of those, claims 1-88, 130-236, 272-375 and 417-441 had been withdrawn from consideration.

The Examiner finally rejected claims 89-92, 104, 105, 109, 110, 115, 118, 119, 122-125, 127, 128, 237-240, 242, 243, 246, 247, 250, 251, 254, 255, 259, 261, 263, 265-268, 270, 376-379, 381, 382, 386, 387, 391, 392, 396, 397, 402, 404-406, 410-412, 414 and 415 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Tsumpes U.S. Patent No. 6,442,241. Claims 120, 121, 126, 129, 263, 264, 269, 271, 407, 408, 413 and 416 were finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Tsumpes in view of Motoyama et al. U.S. Publication No. 2003/0195982.

On December 7, 2004, applicants filed a Reply Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 to Office Action, replying to the final Office Action. On January 28, 2005, the Examiner issued an Advisory Action denying entry to the amendments in the December 7, 2004 reply, but stating that those amendments would have placed claims 89-129, 237-271 and 376-416 in condition for allowance. The Examiner further indicated that claims 89-129, 237-271 and 376-416 would be allowed if applicants filed an amendment cancelling the withdrawn claims. Accordingly, this Second Reply Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 is being filed.

### Telephonic Interview Summary

Applicants and the undersigned would like to thank the Examiner for courtesies extended during the telephonic interview of October 12, 2004. During the interview, the Examiner clarified the rejections and expressed that these rejections may be overcome through a further amendment to

more particularly define the user control interface in the claims.'

#### Applicants' Reply

Applicants note with appreciation the indication in the Advisory Action of allowable subject matter in claims 89-219, 237-271 and 376-416. However, this reply discusses the application as it was rejected in the final Office Action.

In the final Office Action, claims 89-92, 104, 105, 109, 110, 115, 118, 119, 122-125, 127, 128, 237-240, 242, 243, 246, 247, 250, 251, 254, 255, 259, 261, 263, 265-268, 270, 376-379, 381, 382, 386, 387, 391, 392, 396, 397, 402, 404-406, 410-412, 414 and 415 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Tsumpes. Claims 120, 121, 126, 129, 263, 264, 269, 271, 407, 408, 413 and 416 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsumpes in view of Motoyama.

The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants have proposed amending claims 89, 237 and 376 to more particularly define the invention. No new subject matter has been added and the amendments are fully supported by the specification. Applicants have also proposed cancelling nonelected claims 1-88, 130-236, 272-375 and 417-441 as suggested by the Examiner in the Advisory Action.

Applicants' invention, as defined by proposed amended independent claims 89, 237 and 376, is a system or a method for monitoring user premises. At least one sensor, at least one alarm output device, at least one user control interface, and a system controller connected to the at least one sensor, alarm output device, and user control interface

---

\* Applicants summarized the October 12, 2004 in the December 7, 2004 reply. However, because that reply was not entered, applicants are again summarizing the interview in this reply.

are provided. At least one user control interface is located at the user premises and is connected to an external data network such as the Internet for sending and/or receiving data. Such data may include security data (e.g., for reporting security status of the premises to a central monitoring station) and non-security data such as electronic mail messages and web pages that are not related to security functions (see Specification, Paragraphs [0072] and [0073]). The user control interface enables a user at the user premises to interact with the system controller as well as the data. For example, the user may manipulate securities functions and/or send emails using the user control interface.

Tsumpes shows an event notification system. One or more sensors and a controller, to which the sensors are connected, are placed at a monitored site. The controller detects changes in status at the sensors and reports the changes to a remotely-located central monitoring station (e.g., through a telephone network) (see column 4, line 56 through column 5, line 3). The central monitoring station automatically provides an event-specific notification to one or more persons in response to being notified of the triggering event by the controller (see abstract). The central monitoring station provides an interactive website through an Internet Service Provider ("ISP"). A user may access the website, for example, using his own Internet-enabled personal computer, to customize various options associated with events to be monitored and notified (see column 5, lines 47-54).

The Examiner contended that Tsumpes discloses each and every feature of applicants' claims 89, 237 and 376. Applicants disagree and submit that Tsumpes at least fails to show or suggest a user control interface, located at the user premises and connected to the system controller and an external data network for sending and/or receiving data, where the user control interface enables a user at the user premises to interact with the system controller and the data

sent to or received from the external data network, as defined by proposed amended claims 89, 237 and 376.

The Examiner, in contending that Tsumpes shows the above-mentioned feature, points to the disclosure that a subscriber of Tsumpes' system "can access an interactive website 24 via the Internet" (see final Office Action, page 2). Applicants respectfully submit that this disclosure does not show or suggest a user control interface as required by proposed amended claims 89, 237 and 376. As described above, applicants' user control interface is an integrated component of the security system. Specifically, the user control interface is connected at the user premises to the system controller as well as the external data network. It enables the user at the user premises to interact with both security functions and data and non-security data. In contrast, Tsumpes does not provide such an integrated user control interface. Rather, it provides a stand-alone website through an ISP. A subscriber may only access Tsumpes' website, for example, using his own Internet-enabled personal computer or another suitable Internet-enabled device that is separate from the security system.

Accordingly, at least because Tsumpes fails to show or suggest a user control interface located at the user premises and connected to the system controller and an external data network for sending and/or receiving data, claims 89, 237 and 326, if amended as proposed, would be patentable over Tsumpes.

As mentioned in applicants' previous reply, Motoyama is cited by the Examiner only for its alleged disclosure of a firewall. Without addressing whether or not Motoyama show a firewall, applicants respectfully submit that Motoyama does not show or suggest applicants' user control interface that is located at the user premises and connected to the system controller and an external data network for sending and/or receiving data. Accordingly,


proposed amended claims 89, 237 and 376 are also allowable over the combination of Tsumpes and Motoyama.

Each of claims 90-129, 238-271 and 377-416 depends, directly or indirectly, from one of claims 89, 237 and 326, and therefore each is also patentable over Tsumpes and the combination of Tsumpes and Motoyama.

#### Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, applicants respectfully submit that this application, if amended as proposed, would be in condition for allowance, and the Examiner has agreed in the Advisory Action. Reconsideration, entry of the proposed amendments, and prompt allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jeffrey H. Ingberman  
Reg. No. 31,069  
Attorney for Applicants  
FISH & NEAVE IP GROUP  
ROPES & GRAY LLP  
Customer No. 1473  
1251 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10020-1105  
Tel.: (212) 596-9000